

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Applicants have carefully considered this application in connection with the Examiner's Final Rejection electronically delivered August 13, 2009, the Advisory Action electronically delivered November 4, 2009, and the telephonic interview with the Examiner on December 9, 2009. The Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of this application in view of the foregoing amendment and the following remarks.

The Applicant originally submitted Claims 1-20 in the application. In the present response, the Applicants have amended independent Claims 1, 8, and 15 as discussed in the telephonic interview of December 9, 2009. Support for the amendment can be found, *e.g.*, in paragraph [0031] and Fig. 2 of the original specification. No other claims have been canceled or added. Accordingly, Claims 1-20 are currently pending in the application.

I. Rejection of Claims 1-3, 6-10, and 13-14 under 35 U.S.C. §103

Previously, the Examiner rejected Claims 1-3, 6-10, and 13-14 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0110086 by Reches (hereinafter "Reches") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,412,648 to Fan (hereinafter "Fan"). During the telephonic interview of December 9, 2009, the Examiner indicated that the amendment presented above overcomes the teachings of Reches. More specifically, the Examiner indicated that Reches only teaches that a FIFO interposes a destination FIFO and only one input and that Reches does not teach or suggest that each of the *n* crossbar FIFOs of Reches interposes a corresponding one of each of the *n* inputs as presently claimed. As such, the cited portions of the cited combination of Reches

and Fan, as applied by the Examiner, do not provide a *prima facie* case of obviousness for presently amended independent Claims 1 and 8 and Claims that depend thereon. Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the §103(a) rejection of Claims 1-3, 6-10, and 13-14 and allow issuance thereof.

II. Rejection of Claims 4-5 and 11-12 under 35 U.S.C. §103

Previously, the Examiner rejected Claims 4-5 and 11-12 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Reches in view of Fan and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,975,638 to Chen, *et al.* (hereinafter "Chen"). As established above, Reches and Fan do not provide a *prima facie* case of obviousness for presently amended independent Claims 1 and 8. Chen has not been cited to cure the deficiencies of this combination. As such, the cited portions of the cited combination of Reches, Fan, and Chen, as applied by the Examiner, do not provide a *prima facie* case of obviousness for presently amended independent Claims 1 and 8 and Claims that depend thereon. Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the §103(a) rejection of Claims 4-5 and 11-12 and allow issuance thereof.

III. Rejection of Claims 15-17 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. §103

Previously, the Examiner rejected Claims 15-17 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Reches in view of Fan and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 5,905,873 Hartmann, *et al.* (hereinafter "Hartmann"). As established above, the cited portions of the cited combination of Reches and Fan do not provide a *prima facie* case of obviousness for presently amended independent

Claims 1 and 8. Analogously, the cited portions of the cited combination of Reches and Fan of presently amended independent Claim 15. Hartmann has not been cited to cure the deficiencies of this combination. As such, the cited portions of the cited combination of Reches, Fan, and Hartmann do not provide a *prima facie* case of obviousness for presently amended independent Claim 15 and Claims that depend thereon. Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the §103(a) rejection of Claims 15-17 and 20 and allow issuance thereof.

IV. Rejection of Claims 18-19 under 35 U.S.C. §103

Previously, the Examiner rejected Claims 18-19 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Reches in view of Fan and Hartmann and further in view of Chen. As established above, the cited portions of the cited combination of Reches, Fan, and Hartmann do not provide a *prima facie* case of obviousness for presently amended independent Claim 15. Chen has not been cited to cure the deficiencies this combination. As such, the cited portions of the cited combination of Reches, Fan, Hartmann, and Chen do not provide a *prima facie* case of obviousness for presently amended independent Claim 15 and Claims that depend thereon. Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the §103(a) rejection of Claims 18-19 and allow issuance thereof.

IV. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing amendment and remarks, the Applicants now see all of the Claims currently pending in this application to be in condition for allowance and therefore earnestly solicit a Notice of Allowance for Claims 1-20.

The Applicants request the Examiner to telephone the undersigned agent of record at (972) 480-8800 if such would further or expedite prosecution of the present application. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees, credits, or overpayments to Deposit Account No. 08-2395.

Respectfully submitted,

HITT GAINES, P.C.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Steven J. Hanke". The signature is fluid and cursive, with the first name "Steven" and last name "Hanke" clearly distinguishable.

Steven J. Hanke
Registration No. 58,076

Dated: December 11, 2009

P.O. Box 832570
Richardson, Texas 75083
(972) 480-8800